

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

HEARING MINUTES

JULY 28, 2011

Commissioners

Scott Winnette, Chairman

Robert Jones, Vice Chairman

Timothy Wesolek (not present)

Gary Baker

Shawn Burns (not present)

Kate McConnell (not present)

Stephen Parnes

Brian Dylus, Alternate

-

Aldermanic Representative

Michael O'Connor

Staff

Lisa Mroszczyk, Historic Preservation Planner

Scott Waxter, Assistant City Attorney

Joe Adkins, Deputy Director of Planning

Shannon Albaugh, HPC Administrative Assistant

•I. Call to Order

Mr. Winnette called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. He stated that the technical qualifications of the Commission and the staff are on file with the City of Frederick and are made a part of each and every case before the Commission. He also noted that the Frederick City Historic Preservation Commission uses the Guidelines adopted by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation published by the U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and these Guidelines are made a part of each and every case.

All cases were duly advertised in the Frederick News Post in accordance with Section 301 of the Land Management Code.

Announcements

There were no announcements.

II. Approval of Minutes

1. July 14, 2011 Hearing/Workshop Minutes

Motion: Brian Dylus moved to approve the July 14, 2011 hearing/workshop minutes as written.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 5 - 0

- **II. HPC Business**

There was no HPC Business

IV. Consent Items

-

a. Cases to be Approved

2. HPC11-365

12 E. Church Street

BOCC

Remove existing flagpole and install two new poles
agent

Douglas Pearre,

Lisa Mroszczyk

Motion: Stephen Parnes moved to approve the application as submitted.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 5 - 0

b. Cases to be Continued

-

•V. Cases to be Heard

3. HPC11-239

433 N. Market Street

Richard Hudson

Replace storefront framing

Jody Rood, agent

Lisa Mroszczyk

Mr. Winnette announced that originally we did not have a quorum for this case and the applicant was sent home. Now that there is a quorum the case will need to be continued to the next scheduled hearing.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to continue the application to the August 11, 2011 hearing.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 0

4. HPC11-240

59 S. Carroll Street

Harold H. Hauver

Reconstruct fire-damaged building
agent

J. Chris Benjamin,

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the reconstruction and repair of a contributing resource that was extensively damaged by fire as well as the construction of an elevator tower addition. The following work is proposed:

General

- 1. Reconstruction of the second story on the easternmost portion of the building. The new brick second story will have a front gable and a monitor. The eave height will be raised five feet on either side but the ridge height will remain the same as it did historically. Windows are proposed to be paired double steel casements.
- 2. Installation of a new prefinished standing seam snap lock panel roof throughout the existing building.
- 3. Installation new double hung wood windows throughout the existing building, including removal of concrete block infill on the north side.
- 4. Installation of dormers and a monitor on the reconstructed roof of the three story section.
- 5. Installation of galvanized round profile aluminum gutters and downspouts.
- 6. Clean and repoint the existing building.

East wall

- 7. Installation a new tongue-and-groove wood door.
- 8. Repair of existing pipe railing.

South wall

- 9. Replacement in-kind of existing paneled doors in the two story section.
- 10. Installation of new tongue-and-groove wood doors in the existing openings of the three story section.

North wall

- 11. Installation of a tongue-and-groove wood door with a multi-pane sidelight in an existing opening and construction of a wood stair with removable pipe rail at that opening.

- 12. Construction of a three story elevator tower addition. The application includes options for brick, parged CMU and vertical steel siding as wall materials in addition the proposed brick veneer and standing seam metal roof.

Applicant Presentation

Chris Benjamin, representing the owner of 59 S. Carroll Street, stated that they had an issue with the use of standing seam metal roofing because they would like to use a modern pre-finished standing seam metal roof with a cap. He added that they could work with a manufacturer to see about reducing the size of the cap but so far they have not found someone that would be willing to do that and warranty the roof. They have listed as an alternate material a Heritage CertainTeed roof shingle and they would rather not go with that material. Mr. Benjamin went on to say that the owner of the building is not interested in a hand crimped standing seam metal roof. He stated that they agree that they have evidence that there were dormers on the east elevation but he thought that they have shown through the 3-D models that there could have been dormers on the west side of the building in the past and they certainly would have been in the context of the setting for there to have been dormers on the west side of the building. He went on to say that they would accept to use of flat seam metal siding on the dormers. He stated that they were very close to what they need to have for the building. He added that he saw very little in the staff report that they would not be able to deal with to get this building approved.

Harold Hauver, the owner of 59 S. Carroll Street, stated that he went out the past couple weeks and took quite a few photographs where a pre-finished metal roof was installed. One is of Cannon Hill Antiques which is an old stone building and has standing seam metal roofing with a ridge cap and the other is Cannon Hill on E. South Street an old block building that also has standing seam metal with a ridge cap. The precedent has been set and there are old buildings with the new standing seam roof with a cap.

Dave Greber, representing the applicant, stated that his understanding of the philosophy that is applied to the reapplication of the roof is that the Commission needs to determine whether it is going to in effect take a restoration philosophy of this destroyed element of the building or whether it is going to take a re-habilitation philosophy toward this particular element of the building. They are not attempting to put the roof back in any other condition that existed in the previous historic record. They are not trying to recreate or restore what it looked like in the past as much as they are taking a rehabilitation philosophy under the Guidelines toward this element of the building they do not think it is troublesome that there is not a historic record of dormers on the back of the building. They are trying to differentiate this aspect of the building from the remaining historic elements of the building.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Dylus asked if the vertical steel siding at the elevator was a corrugated metal. Mr. Benjamin answered no that the owner's first choice would be ribbed steel siding.

Mr. Parnes asked why the applicant chose the pre-finished standing seam metal roof over the roof that staff suggested. Mr. Benjamin answered that the main issue is the cost and the ability of having a long roof like this one done well. He added that the pre-finished standing seam metal roof is one of the few that offers a 40 year warranty and you can't get that with a hand crimped standing seam roof.

Mr. Baker asked why the applicant extended the roof all the way across and not drop it at the elevator to follow the Guidelines that specifically state to distinguish the old from the new. Mr. Benjamin answered that it was a suggestion made at the last workshop that some Commissioners thought would be better than dropping it about 8 inches so they looked at it and thought it made a lot of sense.

Mr. Winnette asked if the windows were going to be made custom to mimic the other cut sheet that was given to them. Mr. Benjamin answered yes. Mr. Winnette stated that would be satisfactory to him as long as that was articulated in the motion.

Mr. Winnette stated that he was sympathetic about the comments made about the roof and the contrast between restoration and rehabilitation particularly considering the entire roof structure is gone so he felt as if they could consider this differently. The structure and what it will look like would be very much like what was there so it is difficult to go from restoration to rehabilitation. He added that if they were to go down the line and say this should be differentiated as new construction there would need to be something more to differentiate it as new construction. Mr. Baker asked the Commission to keep in mind that there are two different roofs. One is a brand new roof and the other one is directly applied to the bearing points of a very historic structure. Mr. Winnette asked the applicant if they would be willing to put a metal roof on the new construction and shingle on the old which would differentiate the new construction from the rehabilitation. Mr. Benjamin answered that he would find that odd.

Mr. Winnette asked the applicant if they had concerns about how the masonry should be cleaned. Mr. Hauver stated that there are different types of pressure washing. They can use dry ice or powder so it will not damage the stone so he had an issue with them saying no pressure washing.

Mr. Dylus stated that the staff recommendation was for low pressure washing not no pressure washing. Mr. Hauver stated that he would want to leave it up to the masonry professionals whether it is low or high pressure and what they use. He was told that they can use talcum powder, dry ice or walnut shells. He knew that they would not want to use sand because that can be very abrasive but there are ways to use other materials. Mr. Winnette stated that they could put a condition on the approval, assuming it is approved, that they go back to staff with those possibilities for staff approval. Ms. Mroszczyk stated that just because some of the methods suggested do not use sand does not mean they are not abrasive. She added that several of the methods mentioned are discouraged in the National Park Service Preservation Brief on cleaning masonry structures.

Mr. Winnette asked if any other Commissioner's had concerns or thoughts regarding the elevator tower where staff recommended the reduction in height to provide a discernable difference between the two roof structures. Mr. Jones stated that he preferred the different levels to differentiate the two roof structures. Mr. Winnette asked if the applicant would be willing to go back to one of their earlier renderings to provide the reduction in height. Mr. Benjamin answered yes.

Mr. Winnette asked the applicant if he had any comments on the divisions in the glass hyphen on the elevator shaft. Mr. Benjamin stated that he really likes the idea of carrying A&S Window style at the elevator tower. He was in agreement with staff about the concern with the side lights on the door.

Mr. Dylus asked if the applicant if a study has been done on the mechanical systems and how tall they will be and whether they are going to be visible from the street based upon where they plan to put them. Mr. Benjamin answered that they have asked a few different HVAC companies that and they have not been able to get an answer yet. Mr. Dylus asked how tall the parapet wall adjacent to the elevator tower was. Mr. Benjamin answered 4 feet tall.

Public Comment

Joan Jenkins, neighbor of 59 S. Carroll Street, stated that she appreciates the Historic Preservation Commission for all the work they have done because Frederick would not look like it does today without them. She added that she went on a tour of 59 S. Carroll Street before the fire and she knows why the owner loves the building. She also stated she appreciates the fact that he is saving a building from the Civil War that is on that street. He is making the building have the same flare and attitude it had 150 years ago. It is definitely a keystone for our historic structures in this town. She added that she was fine with the fact that he would like to raise the

roof because there was supposed to be an elevator tower on that street in 1862 so there have been many plans made up for that project. She asked the Commission to approve this application with faith in staff because she knows that they all have the same feeling in their hearts that they want to make it the best it can be. She went on to say that they have had the police on their street often so having the look of the burned building is more of a detriment to that street than waiting too many more times than this for hearings and workshops. She felt that the whole point of view is they are building something amazing and he is willing to put it back and it is not ending up in the City landfill.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

- 1. The ridge of the standing seam metal roof be similar to a traditional rolled ridge and not a cap and a detail be submitted for staff approval. If this cannot be achieved with the proposed Coastal Metal Service SS 24/26 product, an alternative product should be submitted for staff approval.
- 2. Dormers on the three story section to have either flat seam metal siding or wood siding in place of the corrugated metal.
- 3. The masonry must be cleaned by the gentlest means possible to include low pressure washing using standard City water pressure without augmentation, mild detergents and soft bristle brushes and all repointing to be completed with a lime-based mortar.
- 4. The sidelight is eliminated from the new door on the north wall in the two story section of the building.
- 5. The elevator tower is reduced in height to provide a discernable difference between the two roof structures.
- 6. The secondary divisions in the glass hyphen are to be eliminated to provide greater differentiation between the old and new structure. The line of the door at the first and second floor should be carried through the third floor.
- 7. Materials in the elevator tower addition to include parged CMU at the first floor and brick at the second and third floor. The final brick selection must be submitted for staff approval.
- 8. All new windows and doors must fit within the existing openings.
- 9. Replacement windows in the historic to be Kolbe & Kolbe Heritage Series Double Hung Wood Windows with "Performance Divided Lite" with a 5/8" or 7/8" muntins with a dark color, non-metallic spacer bar or comparable to be approved by staff.
- 10. Windows in the second story addition to be A&S Window Associates, Inc., Series 200 Profile double casement steel windows or comparable to be approved by staff.

Staff recommends denial of the west facing dormers because they are not substantiated by documentary of physical evidence and are thus inconsistent with the *Frederick Town Historic District Design Guidelines*. Staff also recommends denial of the replacement of the historic

paneled wood doors on the south side of the building because they are not deteriorated beyond repair and contribute to the character of this building.

Motion: Brian Dylus moved to approve the drawings dated July 19, 2011 elevations A-301A, A-302, A-303 and A-304 as submitted with the following conditions:

- A cut sheet be provided on the vertical steel at the elevator shaft for staff approval;
- The mechanical systems be not visible from the public right of way;
- The brick pattern be an American running bond;
- The dormers on the three story section have flat seam metal siding;
- The masonry be cleaned by the gentlest methods possible as recommended by the owner's contractor with approval by staff;
- The side light is eliminated from the new door on the north wall in the two story section of the building;
- All new windows and doors fit within the existing openings;
- The replacement windows in the historic structure be Kolbe & Kolbe Heritage Series double hung wood windows with a 5/8" stock muntin assuming the 5/8" muntin meets the performance characteristics that the manufacturer requires. If the 5/8" muntin does not work it will need to be submitted to staff for approval;
- The windows in the second story addition be A&S Associate Inc., Series 200 Profile double casement steel windows or comparable to be approved by staff;
- The replacement of the historic panel door on the south side of the building is rebuilt as opposed to replaced; and
- All items that appear on the exterior building be submitted to staff for final approval for color and material selection.

Second: Scott Winnette

Vote: 4 - 1, Gary Baker opposed

5. HPC11-394

150 W. South Street

Thomas Hill, Sr.

Installation of a chain link and stockade fence
Wars agent

Thomas Hill, Jr. & Ed

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that The applicants are seeking post-construction approval for the installation of a new fence along the west side of the rear yard of contributing corner property. The new fencing consists of 8 feet of 6 foot tall stockade fencing and 59'-9" of 4 foot tall chain link fencing.

Applicant Presentation

Ed Wars, representing the owner of 150 W. South Street, stated that 20 or so years ago they erected a fence out there that was stockade that he replaced. The other fence was a split rail, which according to staff is not an approved fence, that sat there for 30 years and no one said anything. Mr. Hill has lived there since his mother passed away and the stockade fence was rotten and falling over. Mr. Wars added that the owner has a lot of foot traffic at night and he wanted some security. He did not have the money to hire a contractor so they erected the fence. Mr. Wars also stated that in that neighborhood there is nothing but chain link fences and the stockade part of the fence has been there for almost 20 years.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Parnes asked if he or the owner were aware that they were in the Historic District and there was a process to follow to get the fence approved. Mr. Wars answered that he knew that area was in the Historic District but he thought that anything that was not attached to house they would not need to get approval for. Mr. Parnes asked if he was aware that there are resources online and in print to get the Guidelines. Mr. Wars answered that in hindsight he does and maybe he should have beforehand but he was given the quick fix for what the owner wanted and his situation.

Mr. Baker stated that he did not see a problem with it at all because they have the existing chain link fence there now and there is nothing wrong with chain link fence. He added that the stockade saw tooth fence is compatible. Mr. Parnes stated that he looked very carefully and the description of the neighborhood is something they should be taking into consideration. He walked all around that area of South Street and he concurred that chain link is all over that neighborhood and there are some pretty unattractive other forms a fencing around there.

Mr. Winnette asked if the applicant would be willing to cut the teeth off the top of the stockade fence. Mr. Wars answered that he would be willing to do that.

Mr. Baker asked the applicant if they were going to paint the fence. Mr. Wars answered that the previous fence was painted so they can go either way.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission deny the application to install a stockade and chain link fence because it is inconsistent with the *Frederick Town Historic District Design Guidelines* and incompatible with the character of this historic residential property.

Motion: Stephen Parnes moved to approve post construction for the new fence along the west side of the rear yard with the condition that the teeth on the stockade fencing be cut down so that it is flat on the top and the fence is painted to preserve it and allow the chain link fencing as is because the project is compatible with the character of the district and in keeping with the Design Guidelines.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 3 - 2, Scott Winnette and Robert Jones opposed

6. HPC11-397

137 N. Market Street

Darrel Guyton

Install handicap access at main entrance

Bruce Mahlandt, agent

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns modifications to a 1980s storefront in order to provide an accessible entrance. Modifications include lowering the concrete slab in the vestibule, removing one door leaf, centering the remaining leaf in the entryway and installing painted wood trim to match the remainder of the storefront.

Applicant Presentation

Bruce Mahlandt, representing the owners of 137 N. Market Street, stated that the owners were asked by a concerned citizen to provide accessibility to the restaurant. The plan shows that they will basically be cutting out the existing step to provide accessibility to the space through a ramp in the interior of the building. He added that they would agree to add glass to the sides in lieu of the wood panels.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Jones asked how far they were going to protrude onto the sidewalk. Mr. Mahlandt answered that it would stay in the same location as before.

Mr. Baker stated that he does not see this application passing ADA requirements. Mr. Mahlandt thought that would be something he would need to talk to Building Codes about and if they need to expand the interior landing to comply with the handicap code, they will do so. Mr. Baker did not think this design was typical of a downtown storefront.

Mr. Dylus asked how the concrete where the step will be cut out is going to be treated. Mr. Mahlandt answered the concrete would be turned back down and rubbed just like a curb.

Mr. Parnes stated that he concern was the door has been shifted and the side lights changed due to ADA and they are not trying to make a decision based on ADA and now the applicant is asking them to them to look at ADA because the drawings were changed. Mr. Parnes suggested going back to the original drawings with the door in the center and approve it with the side lights and they may need to come back if they find out that plan does not meet ADA requirements. Mr. Mahlandt stated that he could attempt to bring this original elevation with glass in lieu of the panels through permits. He thought it was justifiable to do it that way because if they have an automatic door opener on the inside the door is going to open up just like a hallway.

Public Comment

Gil House, member of Frederick County Commission on Disability, appreciated them trying to make the building accessible to people with disabilities. He said that since this is a historic

building there is more leniency as far as what can be done because they would not want to destroy the historic fabric of the building. He added that he would gladly work with them on what they are doing and at least give them some of his comments on the renovation in the interior of the building. He stated that the Commission's only concern should be what the exterior façade of the building looks like and what happens with the sidewalk.

Staff Recommendation

Since the storefront dates from the 1980s and not a contributing feature of this building, staff recommends approval of the application according to drawings A-1 and A-2 dated June 29, 2011 with the following conditions:

- The new trim proposed for either side of the door include glass panels or sidelights in order to maintain the open quality which would be compatible with the character of historic storefronts in this district; and
- That all new wood is not pressure-treated and is painted or stained with a solid color opaque stain; and
- That the transom remains intact unless otherwise approved by this Commission.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved for approval considering the storefront dates from the 1980s and not a contributing feature of this building of the application according to drawings A-1 and A-2 dated June 29, 2011 with the following conditions:

- ○ The new trim proposed for either side of the door include glass panels or sidelights in order to maintain the open quality which would be compatible with the character of historic storefronts in this district; and
- ○ That all new wood is not pressure-treated and is painted or stained with a solid color opaque stain; and
- ○ That the transom remains intact.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 3 - 2, Gary Baker & Robert Jones opposed

7. HPC11-398

49 S. Carroll Street

Jane & Goodloe Byron

Remove second story pent and concrete block infill
agent

Kirsten Peeler,

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the removal of a c. 1970 pent roof from the front of the building to expose the underlying wall and removal of concrete block infill from a former opening on the north wall in order to rehabilitate the building.

Applicant Presentation

Kirsten Peeler, representing the owners of 49 S. Carroll Street, stated that the building underwent alterations including the installation of Portland cement and stucco and infilling numerous windows that were originally located on the north elevation of the building. The applicant is planning to rehabilitate the entire building and in order to rehabilitate the building in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards and the Design Guidelines they would need to remove the existing pent roof to determine what original historic fabric remains and if there is any evidence of remaining cornice that would help guide rehabilitation of the new cornice. They would also like to remove the concrete block infill and at this time they are not sure what kind of door they would want to put in the reopened concrete block opening because the building is going to be subject to a larger rehabilitation.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Mroszczyk asked the applicant if they thought there was another wall behind the concrete wall or is the concrete block all that is there. Ms. Peeler answered that from the outside all you can see is the concrete block. Ms. Mroszczyk stated that the staff recommendation was stating that if there is nothing behind there the Commission would not want to see plywood go in that opening and be there indefinitely. Ms. Peeler stated that something is going to go back in that opening they just are not sure what the design will be. Jane Byron, the owner of the building, stated that they felt like they cannot make a decision until the front is taken off. They want to be consistent with what they do to the front.

Mr. Winnette asked if the applicant would want permission to remove the stucco. Ms. Bryan answered yes. Mr. Winnette stated that they could approve the application in front of them and approval for the removal of the stucco with the condition that they start with a test patch.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the application to remove the c. 1970 pent roof from the east wall of the building and to remove the concrete block infill from the former opening on the north wall with the condition that the applicant submit an amendment application based on the results of the investigation.

Motion: Brian Dylus moved to approve the application to remove the c. 1970 pent roof from the east wall of the building and approve the removal of stucco based upon a test patch subject to staff approval and to remove the concrete block infill from the former opening in the north wall with the condition that the resulting opening be finished under an amended application based on the results of the investigation.

Second: Robert Jones

Vote: 5 - 0

8. HPC11-401

18 Market Space

Darrel Drenner

New side entrance, infill windows, sidewalk alterations and fencing

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the following items:

1. Post-construction approval for a new 40" x 84" door opening in the west wall including a flush steel door.
2. Replacement of the sidewalk at the front of the building with a new sloped concrete sidewalk

3. Installation of a raised concrete walkway on the west side of the building to be level with the existing sidewalk on the north side of the building and to extend to the proposed side entrance.
4. Post-construction approval for the installation of a kitchen hood and exhaust system;
5. Remove an existing air handler, plywood, lintel and sill from the south wall and fill in the opening flush with brick.
6. Fill in four window openings on the south wall flush with brick. Any remaining windows, lintels and sills will be removed.
7. Installation of a gate at the base of the existing exterior staircase and construction of a wall along the side of that staircase. Both the gate and wall will be constructed from 1x4 vertical stained cedar boards.

Applicant Presentation

Darrell Drenner, owner of 18 Market Space, stated that window D is in the women's bathroom and it is half way through the floor of the building so if he were to put in a double hung window the sill would be below the finished floor level inside. He added that plywood was in front of the window before so he did not think he needed approval to infill it with brick. He said that there was not a window in the opening for window A when he purchased the building and it would now interfere with the layout of the bar inside the building. He added that he and Lisa talked about the handicap ramp in the front and he wanted to remove that from the application and he will bring that back at a later date.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Winnette asked if the plywood that is currently there was on the building when it was purchased. Mr. Drenner answered no the plywood that is currently there was installed by him because the plywood that was there when he purchased the building was rotten and water was leaking into the back of the building. So they took all the old walls down and put new metal stud walls and drywall up and while they were doing that he in-filled the window with new metal studs and the plywood that you see now.

Mr. Winnette asked the applicant if wanted to infill all the windows with brick. Mr. Drenner answered that there is one double hung window that is existing on the back and it has been painted and will stay. So he would like approval to infill all the windows except for one.

Mr. Winnette stated that it is a real loss to the building to lose all the windows. Mr. Drenner stated that the neighbors of the building were in agreement with him to infill the windows. Mr.

Jones stated that they are looking at it from a historic perspective. Mr. Winnette stated that he was in agreement with the staff report in that if any of these windows can be preserved or replaced with windows it looks as if that would be window A which means if the Commission goes in that direction he would have to do some interior redesign.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the following work:

- Installation of a new 40"x 80" door opening with a flush steel door.
- Installation of a raised concrete with a brush finish on the west side of the building.
- Installation of a kitchen hood and exhaust system.

Staff recommends approval of the infill of opening B as identified in Staff Attachment #1 with the condition that the older plywood infill is removed, the lintel and sill are retained in place and the brick is recessed.

Staff recommends approval of the infill of non-historic opening C as identified on Staff Attachment #1 and #2.

Staff recommends approval of the removal of the air handler and all associated hardware and the infill of opening E as identified in Staff Attachment #2 with the condition that the lintel and sill are retained in place and the brick is recessed.

Staff recommends approval of the installation of a gate and siding at the existing staircase on the east side of the building with the condition that the material be vertical tongue-and-groove wood siding and that it is painted or stained with a solid color opaque stain that resembles a paint finish.

Staff recommends approval of the infill of opening D and that all windows being infilled would retain the lintel and sill in place and recessing the brick except for the window with the steel lintel.

Staff recommends denial of the proposal to raise the concrete sidewalk at the front of the building because it will conceal or necessitate the removal of the existing historic metal cellar doors and because it has not been demonstrated that there are no other configurations that could provide access to this building.

Staff recommends denial of proposal to infill historic openings A because they would be most appropriately rehabilitated by replacing the plywood with windows to match the existing.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to approve the installation of a new 40"x 80" door opening with a flush steel door, the installation of a raised concrete with a brush finish on the west side of the building, the installation of a kitchen hood and exhaust system and the approval of the following windows to be in filled opening B as identified in the staff attachment #1 with the condition that the older plywood infill is removed and the lintel and sill are retained in place and the brick is recessed with regard to window C also identified in staff attachment 1 & 2 allowed to be in filled with brick. The approval of the air handler and all associated hardware and the infill of opening E as identified in staff attachment #2 with the condition that the lintel and sill are retained in place and the brick is recessed. Also approval for the installation of a gate and siding at the existing staircase on the east side of the building with the condition that the material will be vertical tongue-and-groove wood siding and that it is painted or stained with a solid color opaque stain that resembles the paint finish. The approval of the infill of opening D as identified on attachment 1 and 2 with the condition that the lintel and sill are retained in place and that the brick is recessed.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 4 - 1, Robert Jones opposed

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to approve the replacement of the plywood in window A as it was identified on attachment #1 with a 6/6 wood window.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 0

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:50 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh,

Administrative Assistant